

from the European Union, his business now is in jeopardy of surviving.

And Mr. Dove is not a big contributor to either of the political parties. The authors, again, in this article insinuate that the reason why he is the one getting hurt in this big banana war more than someone else is because he is not a big contributor to the political parties.

This is just a very interesting article that Time magazine reported on that the authors had investigated. Again, it gets back to what the Supreme Court in their decision in Nixon was basically saying, that if there is not reason enough not to prevent corruption from occurring in the political process to justify campaign finance reform, there is certainly enough reason because of the appearance of corruption that other people sitting back in Wisconsin, for instance, the Mr. Doves throughout the country have towards the political process that adds to the cynicism and I think disenchantment and eventually disenfranchisement of their participation in the political process.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from characterizing the Senate action or inaction.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON MARCH 8, 2000

Mr. SESSIONS (during special order of Mr. KIND), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-505) on the resolution (H. Res. 425) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1827, GOVERNMENT WASTE CORRECTIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. SESSIONS (during special order of Mr. KIND), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-506) on the resolution (H. Res. 426) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1827) to improve the economy and efficiency of government operations by requiring the use of recovery audits by Federal agencies, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### NIGHT-SIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening during the next hour I would

like to have a night-side chat with my colleagues in regards to a number of different issues.

The first issue that I would like to start out with is the death tax or the estate tax. Then I would like to move on and cover a few points on the marriage penalty tax, move from there to an issue that I think has become fundamentally important to the defense of this country, and that is the missile defense. In fact, tonight I intend to spend a good deal of time discussing the missile defense of the United States of America.

Then if we have an opportunity, I would like to move on to the Social Security earnings limitation repeal. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has stepped forward. And I think tomorrow we will see a very close to a unanimous vote to lift the earnings cap for those people between 65 and 70 years old who are being unfairly penalized by the tax law.

So I do publicly want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), and I would also like to congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON). Both of those gentlemen have worked very hard.

I also want to congratulate the Democrats who have finally come on board with the Republican bill to help us get rid of this unfair taxation. Then if we have a little time after that, I would like to talk about the Internet, a taxation on the Internet. So there are a number of issues tonight on our night-side chat that we can discuss.

But let us first start with the death tax. What is the death tax, number one? Number two, what property does this tax tax that has not already been taxed? In this country, there is a tax called the estate tax. If one's accumulation of property during one's lifetime, property, by the way, of which one already has paid taxes upon at least once, if that property accumulates over a certain amount of money, the Government comes in after one's death and mandates upon one's surviving members, one's family, that an additional tax be levied on this property that has already been taxed.

It is probably in our Tax Code the most unfair, punitive tax that we have got. There is no basis of justification to go and tax somebody upon their death, their estate upon their death, on property that throughout their entire lifetime they have paid taxes after taxes after taxes. It is as if the Government just did not get enough.

Now, one would ask, why is something like that in our Tax Code? Why is it not easy just to take it out? Well, I can tell you. The Clinton administration, and, frankly, most of the Democrats in the House, have opposed taking or getting rid of the estate tax. They say it is a tax for the rich.

Well, what I invite those people to do is come out, for example, to the State of Colorado or go to any State in the Union and take a look at small businesses that are now being impacted by

the death tax. Take a look at what happens to families from the personal level when the Government comes into their life after having taxed their property throughout their life and says we have got to take one more hit at the deceased. We need to go in and assess a tax simply based on the reason that they died.

This tax has devastating impacts. I will give my colleagues an example. I have a good friend of mine who is now deceased. But this friend, we will call him Mr. Joe, Mr. Joe years and years ago started out as a bookkeeper in a local construction company. He worked very, very hard in that construction company. After a while, he got an opportunity through years of hard work to buy some stock in the construction company. He was not a wealthy man. But he and his family, his wife, they scraped together a few pennies here, a few pennies there. They watched their expenses, and they invested in stock.

Well, 5 or 6 years ago, in some of his investments, he sold some of those investments, and he was hit with a tax called capital gains.

Now, most of the citizens of this country will be assessed a capital gains taxation. If one's mutual funds, if one bought property, if one owns stock outside of mutual funds, it is a gain upon property that one has made, and they give a capital tax on it.

So that is what they did when Mr. Joe sold his property. He was hit with a capital gains taxation at that time, which was around the rate of 28 percent.

So take out a pencil, figure out that Mr. Joe, who had worked throughout his entire life, had accumulated property, sold a portion of that property, and on the profit on that property, 28 percent taxation.

Unfortunately, my friend Mr. Joe became terminally ill within a month or so after the sale of this property. Even more unfortunate was that he passed away 2 or 3 months after that. The Government then came in to that family and said we realize that your father in this case has paid on time as a responsible citizen of this country taxes on the property that now belongs to the estate. But we are here for a second dip in the pot. The Government has come back, and we think it is necessary to tax the estate of the deceased person. What did they do to that estate? Exactly what they did to that estate, they hit it with taxes which, when you add it to the capital gains tax, gives it an effective tax rate of about 72 percent. Seventy-two percent on that estate is what was paid in taxation.

Now, let me tell you where the hardship comes in. Number one, 72 percent, imagine, you kind of figure out in your own mind what property you have in your home, what property you and your family has in your home that you own. Then try to determine 72 percent of it that you would like to cut out of it to give to the Government, even though you already paid taxes on it.